DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 278 CS 202 683

AUTHOR Dozier, David Michael
TITLE A Test of the Ludenic Newsreading Theory Using R-Factor Analysis.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (Ottawa, Ontario, August 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Audiences; Higher Education; Journalism; Media Research; News Media; *Newspapers; Public Opinion; *Reading Habits; *Reading Interests; Research Methodology; *School Newspapers
IDENTIFIERS *Ludenic Newsreading Theory; Stephenson (William)

ABSTRACT

William Stephenson's ludenic newsreading theory, which asserts that the newsreading situation is not one in which information is passed from a communication source to a receiver, but one in which the individual plays with communication, is examined in this study. Four postulates from the theory are tested in relation to student newspaper demands: Play elements are involved in demands made on an ideal student newspaper; a factor, or factors, reflecting the demands of mature newsreaders will emerge through factor analysis of ideal newspaper demands; a factor, or factors, reflecting the demands of pleasure readers will emerge through factor analysis of ideal newspaper demands; and a factor, or factors, reflecting the demands of nonpleasure readers will emerge through factor analysis of ideal newspaper demands. It was found that if the absence of play among potential newsreaders is positively correlated with nonreadership, then play's primacy as an exploratory construct is supported. Recognition of the utility of play could provide media practitioners with a perspective from which to evaluate demands for entertainment, mature play, moral responsibility, and social utility. The theory deserves further exploration. (RB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED122278

A TEST OF THE LUDENIC NEWSREADING THEORY USING R-FACTOR ANALYSIS

David Michael Dozier
Program in Mass Communications
California State University, Fresno

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David Michael Dozier

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Paper presented to the Annual Convention of the
Association for Education in Journalism, Ottawa, Canada,
August, 1975

CS202683

William Stephenson's ludenic newsreading theory, while profound in its implications for communication theory and practices, has been largely ignored in the eleven years since its presentation.[1] The innovative theory, which asserts that "the (newsreading) situation is not one in which information is passed from a communication source to a receiver (but) one in which the individual plays with communication," rests empirically on a relatively innovative methodology: Q-technique.[2] Rather than testing relationships between objective measures of newsreading behavior and demographic variables,[3] Stephenson concerns himself with things individual readers can describe of their own subjective reading experiences. Using Q-technique, he intensively examined several small, non-random samples of newsreaders, rather than taking an extensive (although circumspect) look at a larger, more representative sample. As such, critics of the ludenic newsreading theory have concerned themselves at least as much with its methodological problems as with its substance.[4]

R-factor analysis is suggested here as a means to test the ludenic theory independent of Q-technique. In the spring, 1974, a questionnaire tapping attitudes toward the student press was administered to a random sampling of student newsreaders at California State University, Fresno. The three-page questionnaire dealt primarily with local policy issues, but one section was concerned with general, theoretical matters. Items tapping ideal demands of student newspapers were assembled, including political and informational demands. Also included were opinion statements synthesized from deductive inferences of the ludenic newsreading theory. Random sampling (n=220) provided confidence, at around the .95 level of probability, that usable responses were representative of all

non-commuting, full-time sophomores, juniors and first-year graduate students registered that spring semester. The self-referent opinion statements, 20 in all, were factor analyzed to provide a rough, exploratory test of the ludenic readership typology. Since Stephenson's typology rests on the presence (or absence) of certain characteristics of play in newsreading, interpretation of play items on the emerging factors provided an implicit test of play theory itself.

Play Theory Defined

Briefly, Stephenson's play theory of mass communication (of which the ludenic newsreading theory is but a part) incorporates Huizinga's arguments that play--i.e., activities not associated with "work" or "survival," but pursued as ends in themselves--constitutes an irreducible aspect of human behavior essential to the formation of culture.[5] Drawing on Rogers' self theory of personality[6] and Szasz' concept of communication-pleasure,[7] Stephenson described play as pleasurable activities through which the self is enhanced. Communication-pleasure occurs through absorbing, non-purposive conversation between people, marked by elements of play, which participants later recall as pleasurable. Communication-pain, on the other hand, is associated with any call to action, any communicated demand for change in the status quo. Communication-pain is associated with loss of self.[8]

Huizinga identified several characteristics of play[9] which Stephenson applied to newsreading.[10] Newsreading is "voluntary, not a task or a duty," nor is it "part of the reader's ordinary real life."[11] Newsreading, said Stephenson, is "an interlude, an act of 'pretending,' a temporary event, satisfying in itself and ending there."[12] Newsreading is secluded

and absorbing "whether it is at breakfast, or at the coffee break, in a commuter train . . ." and is thus "hedged off from everyday surroundings, especially marked off, as a child marks out its space and time for a game of houses."[13]

Stephenson differentiated between pure play, typified by the spontaneous, disordered activities of children, and game-type play, with rituals, internal order and consciousness of self. He coined ludenic play to describe both types of play.[14]

To Stephenson, the play theory of mass communication is "supraordinate" to prior theory in this area.[15] The ludenic newsreading theory accounts for evidence which supports earlier theory, while clearing up some problems that the "information" theories could not take into account. Earlier, Berelson noted that papers were genuinely missed during newspaper strikes, as newsreading was often habituated.[16] Janowitz provided evidence that community newspapers found it profitable to enhance the self-images and lifestyles of their readers.[17] Cooley was intrigued by newsreading, where the copious, ephemeral "gossip" of the world absorbed readers without inspiring or uplifting them.[18]

Theoretical Developments

Schramm, the first of the general newsreading theorists, provided early evidence that newsreaders acted in anticipation of rewards which the transfer of new information provided.[19] Immediate rewards--associated with news of crime, scandal and marital feuds--attracted poorer, less-educated readers. Delayed rewards--associated with news of civic affairs, politics, international news and scientific discoveries--attracted older, more-affluent and better-educated readers.[20] Specifically, Schramm asserted

that the immediate reward of reduced psychological need characterized the former type of news. The latter type of news offered a delayed reward to the newsreader--the immediate effort and discomfort associated with reading this type of news was offset by a better adjustment to reality over the long run. Using Freudian concepts, Schramm argued that immediate-reward newsreaders used the news as an escape into fantasy, while the readers of delayed-reward news sought reality.[21]

General newsreading theory underwent changes at the hands of other researchers. Kay critized the a priori classification of news into immediate- and delayed-reward categories.[22] He argued that the newsreader's apperception--i.e., the interplay of perceptions plus interpretation--determined the actual reward value of any article on an individual basis.[23] Wiebe, writing after Stephenson, took issue with both Schramm and Kay, who both assumed that readers necessarily read to learn something new from the newspaper.[24] Wiebe argued that, despite any media attempts to provide directive communications, messages are apperceived by receivers as of maintenance or restorative types. He defined directive messages as those requiring change or new adjustments of receivers, while maintenance messages are merely added to the receivers prior conceptions and restorative messages represent token attacks on authority.[25] He asserted that media consumers seek reworkings of the familiar in the news,[26] as when a reader peruses an article on a subject with which he is already fully informed. Yet Wiebe relegated play to childhood's realm, where fantasy serves no higher purpose than as an outlet for aggression.[27]

Stephenson's Readership "Types"

Stephenson anticipated Wiebe's "reworking of the familiar" in his rejection of arguments that the seeking of new information provides

primary motivation in newsreading behavior. In a series of Q-studies of newsreading designed to testing existing theory in this area, students of Stephenson discovered play elements as important newsreading characteristics.[28] From these studies, Stephenson interpreted three broad newsreading types. One such factor, the M (mature) type, makes an elaborate game of newsreading, and the interests of this type are wide-ranging. For M, reading is "thoroughly habituated, absorbing, enjoyable, an interlude in the day, self-enhancing." Another type, the P (pleasure) reader, treats newsreading as "pure play," as "entertainment," and to "pass the time." The third type, the N (non-pleasure) readers, are "sometimes essentially non-readers," who don't find newspapers "absorbing, enjoyable or the like," who see the newspaper as sinful or only as a utilitarian instrument for sales and movie listings.[29]

Stephenson's concern with the subjective experience of the individual newsreader drew sharp criticism from DeFleur.[30] While the ordinary citizen may find mass communications a "form of play," DeFleur argued that media consumption "has meaning and significance beyond the personal perspectives of individuals."[31] The subtle effects of media on people, DeFleur argued, were of greater interest than the "trivial matter" of an individual's subjective play with communication.[32]

Play Theory Implications

On the theoretical level, acceptance of subjective play as involved in the newsreading process implies consequences that are far from trivial. Media subtly affect how people think, how they see themselves and the world, even how they may behave. Yet all such effects are mediated at the point where the reader chooses one publication or one article over another, or chooses not to read at all. If play characteristics affect these decisions,

then the reader's subjective reading experience becomes a crucial link in the complex social interactions where attitudes and behavior are affected.

As a practical matter, the ludenic theory provides a powerful tool for editors and newsmen concerned with how the journalistic product is perceived and utilized by readers. Since journalists work hard to gather and edit the news, they may be less likely than others to recognize playfulness in newsreading. If play underlies much newsreading behavior, as Stephenson suggested, then journalists could judiciously incorporate play elements into their articles as a means of improving the traditional labor of media: informing the public. Indeed, an intuitive sense of play predicates human interest stories.[33] Stephenson's typologies allow publication designs consistent with the type of ludenic play favored by a particular target audience. Further, the ludenic theory provides a rationale for media diversity, not premised on the libertarian principles discredited in some circles, but on the pragmatic concern that readers be allowed to converge selectively on the news--i.e., that individuals have something different to select for themselves.[34]

With both theoretical and pragmatic concerns at issue, the ludenic newsreading theory need not wait for resolution of debate over its methodological origins. The theory can be tested and put to good use, without regard to the merits of Q-technique. In fact, the value of theory lies in its ability to spur further research.[35] Several postulates are suggested by Stephenson's readership typology concerning the interrelationships of student newspaper demands. They are:

1. Play elements are involved in demands made of an ideal student newspaper.

2. A factor, or factors, reflecting the demands of mature newsreaders

will emerge through factor analysis of ideal newspaper demands.

3. A factor, or factors, reflecting the demands of pleasure readers will emerge through factor analysis of ideal newspaper demands.

4. A factor, or factors, reflecting the demands of non-pleasure readers will emerge through factor analysis of ideal newspaper demands.

Methodology

A random sample of names was drawn from university records representing about six per cent of the student body at California State University, Fresno. All freshmen, seniors, second-year graduate students, part-time students and students commuting more than two hours a day were removed from the sample. The first three categories were eliminated due to policy concerns, as the overall questionnaire was concerned with changes in the newspaper to be implemented the following year. Removal of non-returning students, as well as students new to college, seemed desirable. The latter categories constituted circumstantial non-readers whose responses were difficult to get. The same factors which made their respondent members unavailable for polling purposes also made them unlikely campus news readers as well. Thus, the final population did not include many non-readers.

Within the above limitations, the sample was representative of the student newspaper readership. Students were asked, in part, to evaluate 20 statements on a seven-point, Likert-type, agree-disagree scale. Statements were evaluated in terms of "the Daily Collegian now" as well as in terms of "your ideal of how a student newspaper should function."[36] Of interest here are the "ideal" ratings which tap real or latent opinion rather than status quo attitudes.[37] The poll was conducted over a two week period with 80 per cent of the respondents completing the questionnaire

in the first five days. After careful briefing, reporting students in three journalism classes were each assigned from five to seven respondents to contact and have complete the questionnaire. The pollsters encountered a refusal rate of about 27 per cent, high for face-to-face polling methods.

This introduced the question as to whether this high rate was due to inherent weaknesses within the questionnaire or whether organismic variables of pollsters themselves were at issue. Since each respondent had been randomly assigned to the pollsters, the researcher felt that survey results would not be contaminated if differing abilities or zeal among pollsters accounted for the high refusal rate. Accordingly, the chi square test of statistical significance was applied to test whether the frequency of refusal was relatively uniform for all pollsters (which would be evidence of questionnaire weaknesses) or whether it was not. The latter proved to be the case at the .95 probability level (x^2=65.22, d.f.=46). Thus, the high refusal rate was not deemed detrimental to the study, particularly since the sample was overdrawn by nearly two per cent.

The questionnaire consisted of 18 items selected according to quasi-balanced block design (see Table 1), and two "transitional items." One transitional item (24) could be considered loosely tied to the three cells of the design: political, informational and play demands. That item ("It emphasizes news about good acts and things."), however, is not closely tied to any one. While extraneous to the design, per se, the item taps student attitudes toward happy talk news, a trend in broadcast journalism which might be of some relevance to newsreading theory. Item 18, generally an informational demand, also taps play demands when rejected by a respondent: "Its basic goal is to inform and persuade, not to

entertain."

The political demands reflect a spectrum of attitudes, ranging from moral and ethical issues to legal concerns. Informational items reflect either a concern for information transmission or concern for the mechanisms useful in the evaluation of information or information sources. Play items are of two sub-types, reflecting both pure and game-type play attitudes. Items 15, 17 and 19 reflect game-type, mature-reader attitudes while items 21, 27 and 18 (transitional) reflect concern for pure play elements in newsreading. Item 12 might be of either type.

Arrangement of items into this design helps researchers select items tapping the major areas of theoretical concern. Of course, the design, especially one incorporating only 20 variables, can not reflect all opinions and demands in this area. However, for exploratory purposes, such a rough approach is useful, especially if new typologies are generated which spur further, more precise research. The use of factor analysis here allowed exploration of the previously uncharted area of student demand types, as recommended by Rummel and by Selltiz.[38]

While exploratory, this study is more "representative" than its Q-study counterparts, in that random sampling techniques are utilized. As R-factors, the types here represent interrelated items or demands, while Q-method derives factors from interrelations of people. Survey data were factor analyzed on a Control Data Corporation 3170 computer, using subprogram FACTOR of SPSS.[39] Using the principal factor with iteration method (PA-2), six factors with eigenvalues greater-than-one were extracted and rotated to final solution (varimax). The initial factor matrix, with eigenvalues and communalities and the rotated varimax matrix are shown

in Tables 3 and 4 respectively. The correlation coefficients for the 20 variables factor analyzed are shown in Table 2.

Results

While six factors (with eigenvalues greater-than-one) emerged as significant, only five are interpreted here. Factor III, while accounting for more variance than an average item in the array, could not be interpreted due to the ambiguous loadings of the items (only three were significant; only one was salient). Salient was Item 25, with a loading of .64, followed by non-salient Items 24 and 12, with respective loadings of .47 and .26. While something akin to nostalgia or "pollyannaism" may be involved, further research is required to determine what is at issue in the covariance of items with Factor III. Low eigenvalues for factors IV, V and VI in the final varimax matrix makes interpretation of these factors tentative, hopefully spurring further inquiry.

Five interpretable factors remain. Consistent with R-methodology, each factor is interpreted here in descriptive terms, based on the inter-correlation of items with each other and their loadings on the factors.

Factor I: Journalistic Idealism. While 11 items load significantly on Factor I, only seven fall above a natural break in the loadings and are closely interrelated (see Table 2). The four lower items correlate (in essentially spurious fashion) with only one other item in the array. The loadings and items were:

Load	Item	Statement
.67	16.	Its writers admit their errors.
.61	17.	It gives students interesting things to talk about.
.60	11.	It gives no favored treatment to any interest group.

Load	Item	Statement
.57	15.	It's articles are in good journalistic style, like the N.Y. Times.
.56	29.	It is objective.
.56	12.	It encourages students to write whatever they want for it.
.48	19.	It is "balanced," offering a wide variety of things.

Items 11 and 17 were salient--i.e., significantly loaded on only one factor--while items 19 and 29 were virtually salient, with only marginally significant loadings on other factors. A common thread of idealism unifies Factor I. The student newspaper is expected to deal fairly with its readers by being candid and non-partizan (16, 11 and 29) while maintaining interesting style and diverse content (17, 15, 12 and 19). Such commonly-held idealistic views of journalism were not unexpected, given the ideal condition of instruction. Issues of obscenity, legal responsibility, "hard news vs. features" and faculty/administration influence are not at issue.

Factor II: Moral Responsibility. Four items loaded significantly on Factor II, two of them saliently. They were:

Load	Item	Statement
.60	20.	It avoids printing things that are obscene or offensive.
.53	13.	Those legally responsible for the newspaper content should be in charge of the newspaper.
.44	15.	Its articles are in good journalistic style, like the N.Y. Times.
.27	14.	It crusades actively for just causes.

Items 20 and 13 are salient. While Factor I reflects idealist journalistic demands, Factor II reflects demands of a moral imperative. The primary concern with obscenity in Item 20 is reflected in Item 13, where those legally responsible--e.g., administrators and faculty--are expected to maintain standards of good taste in the newspaper. Good taste is equated with good style

in Item 15, where stylistic concerns likely involve propriety, not reader interest or readability. The moral imperative is reflected in Item 14, although "just causes" here would not involve protecting minority interests or uncovering misdeeds--such items are not loaded on this factor.

Factor IV: Social Responsibility. While a moral imperative underlies Factor II, Factor IV incorporates demands for social justice. Significant items are:

Load	Item	Statement
.50	30.	It avoids trivial things.
.49	26.	It safeguards the rights and identities of minorities.
.34	28.	It uncovers things the administration tries to hide.
.30	16.	Its writers admit their errors.
.28	19.	It is "balanced," offering a wide variety of things.
.27	29.	It is objective.

Item 30 is salient, while Item 26 is virtually salient with only a marginal loading on Factor I. Factor IV reflects a non-nonsense attitude toward journalism, plus the prescription that it serve a general type of social good. Items 16, 19 and 29 represent demands which, taken together, constitute a mechanism for allowing journalism to perform this service. Item 19, in this context, reflects a concern for political "balance," perhaps including special attention to minority issues, than a concern for reader-oriented diversity. In fact, a concern for reader interest is absent in the demands of Factor IV.

Factor V: Journalistic Independence. While the pursuit of the social good in Factor IV is general, institutionalized and somewhat passive, the demands implicit in Factor V that the newspaper serve some social good are

specific and activistic. The significant items are:

Load	Item	Statement
.62	22.	Its free from faculty influence.
.48	28.	It uncovers things the administration tries to hide.
.47	23.	It exposes racism and sexism by administrators, faculty and students.
.32	12.	It encourages students to write whatever they want for it.
.25	16.	Its writers admit their errors.

Items 22 and 23 are salient. Journalistic independence and activism set Factor V off from the rest. Concern for the social good here leads to specific demands that the newspaper "uncover" and "expose" various misdeeds. Independence is reflected in items 22 and 12. Items 26 and 23 provide interesting contrasts between Factor IV and Factor V. The intent in each item is the same, but the emphasis in the former is passive and institutional while specific and activistic in the latter.

Factor VI: Journalistic Entertainment. The various moral and social demands made of newspapers, even the Factor I demands for fairness and candor, are not at issue in Factor VI. The significant loadings are:

Load	Item	Statement
-.51	18.	Its basic goal is to inform and persuade, not to entertain.
.51	27.	It helps students take their minds off school work.
.50	21.	It doesn't take itself or life too seriously.

All loadings are salient. The sole concern or demand of Factor VI is that student newspapers entertain, that they provide "escape" and approach life in a lighthearted manner.

Conclusions

Caution must be exercised when comparing the Stephenson Q-factors, representing types of newsreaders, with the R-factors representative here of the interrelated demands made of student newspapers. Yet the ludenic newsreading theory, to be of genuine utility, must be something more than a creature of Q-methodology. The test of the ludenic theory lies in the role that play elements occupy in these demands. The logical demands of mature, pleasure and non-pleasure readers provided propositions to be tested in rough fashion using factor analysis. Further research is needed to expand and refine these new typologies.

Yet theory testing has historically involved far more than categorical interpretation. As Stephenson implies in his credo of metascience, it is often a creative process involving a posteriori leaps from any findings viewed not from item to item but in an overall way that may exceed the sum of various parts.[40] Such is the nature of the case at hand.

Factor I, which accounts for most of the variance, can thus be interpreted in terms of ludenic theory. Salient Item 17, which demands that the paper provide students "interesting things to talk about," emphasizes the newspaper's role in stimulating communication-pleasure. In play terms, Item 15 demands "good journalistic style," reflecting a concern for orderly design and readability, enhancing game-type play. Item 12 reflects a seemingly "pure play" attitude, but other significantly loaded items indicate that students "write whatever they want" within the framework of journalistic order. The overall concern is not so much with independence or freedom as with diversity, reflected in the further demand that the paper offer "a wide variety of things." Play for Factor I is tempered with the concern that newspapers be fair, objective and candid about their errors. One

might expect Stephenson's mature newsreader to make similar demands.

The mechanism whereby mature play demands become merged with idealistic notions of journalistic fairness deserves further study. Issues of newspaper objectivity, impartiality and candor seem to fall within the realm of social control, where complex interactions lead to a consensus. According to Stephenson, social control is at issue when diverse individual attitudes or interests are melded to a common purpose, as when people elect an official to represent all their diverse interests.[41] Convergent selectivity is at issue when the individual selects something different for himself as an assertion of self or identity.[42] Such selections, Stephenson argued, generally involve ephemeral fancies such as "fads," while social control involves more deep-seated values and beliefs.[43] Seemingly for Factor I, a circumspect area of play or convergent selectivity is hedged off in among the socially-controlled demands for candor, fairness and objectivity.

Factor VI also meets the expectations of the ludenic newsreading theory. Contrasting with the well-ordered play implicit in the demands of Factor I, Factor VI incorporates demands for "pure play," the unstructered pleasure of an activity done for itself. As pure play, the journalism implicit in the demands of Factor VI is without rules of any kind, save that it entertain.

Factors II, IV and V were not strictly inferred from Stephenson's newsreading typology, yet they are not inconsistent with his reader types. Demands for moral responsibility, social responsibility and journalistic independence all are of "utilitarian" nature, as were the newspaper interests of Stephenson's non-pleasure reader. Where Stephenson sought typologies premised on newspapers as they are, the ideal condition of instruction

in this study asked respondents to describe newspapers as they should be. As such, the appearance of moral and political demands independent of how one might actually read the newspaper is not surprising. Thus, while the non-pleasure readers might consider newspapers as sinful or say they read them only for the ads, these readers may actually harbor untapped demands that they would nonetheless make of newspapers, whether they read them or not.

While the moral responsibility factor may remain constant across different populations, the "social good" of Factors IV and V may embrace different emphases according to different populations. While college students in California may value exposés of racism, sexism and administrative misdeeds, the "social good" may otherwise be defined in the larger community or in different geographic locations. Journalistic independence in Factor V is tied to specific goals which independence allows the newspaper to pursue; independence here seems conditional and tied to an assumed common view of the social good.

The non-pleasure reader of Stephenson's typology may prove to be a complex creature indeed. Stephenson's assertion that non-pleasure readers are "sometimes essentially non-readers"[44] requires further testing. If significant numbers of actual newsreaders peruse their newspapers without any of the attributes of play, then the ludenic theory provides only a partial explanation of the subjective experience of newsreading behavior. On the other hand, if absence of play among potential newsreaders is positively correlated with non-readership, then play's primacy as an explanatory construct is supported. On the practical level, recognition of the utility of play could provide media practioners with a perspective from which to evaluate demands for entertainment, mature play, moral responsibility and

social utility, among diverse media audiences. Play elements could be systematically incorporated into newspaper content and style, rather than on a haphazard basis. In short, the ludenic theory may be every bit as heuristically valuable as Stephenson suggests. Use of the theory, on both the theoretical and practical levels, will determine its true worth.

Table 1

Survey Items in Balanced Block Design

	Informational Demands
16.	Its writers admit their errors.
22.	Its free from faculty influence.
25.	It is used by the campus administration to discuss and debate campus issues.
28.	It uncovers things the administration tries to hide.
29.	It is objective.
30.	It avoids trivial things.
	Political Demands
11.	It gives no favored treatment to any interest group.
13.	Those legally responsible for the newspaper should be in charge of the paper.
14.	It crusades actively for just causes.
20.	It avoids printing things that are obscene or offensive.
23.	It exposes racism and sexism by administrators, faculty and students.
26.	It safeguards the rights and identities of minority groups.
	Play Demands
12.	It encourages students to write whatever they want for it.
15.	Its articles are in good journalistic style, like the N. Y. Times.
17.	It gives students interesting things to talk about.
19.	It is "balanced," offering a wide variety of things.
21.	It doesn't take itself or life too seriously.

Table 2

Correlation Coefficients for Readership Survey

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
11	1.	.37	.04	.10	.37	.50	.39	.07	.36	-.01	-.04	.16	.14	.31	.22	.33	.13	.20	.38	.26
12	.37	1.	.02	.23	.25	.38	.47	.13	.32	-.07	-.08	.35	.19	.31	.27	.22	.20	.30	.37	.09
13	.04	.02	1.	.18	.23	.11	.09	.10	.08	.31	.09	.15	-.01	.04	.11	.05	.08	.03	.12	.02
14	.10	.23	.18	1.	.32	.27	.26	.10	.23	.12	-.08	.16	.09	.16	.27	.19	.08	.18	.21	.13
15	.37	.25	.23	.32	1.	.54	.33	.20	.37	.28	-.09	.19	-.02	.16	.20	.27	.06	.25	.39	.23
16	.50	.38	.11	.27	.54	1.	.50	.18	.55	.10	-.07	.30	.26	.37	.33	.37	.08	.43	.51	.29
17	.39	.47	.09	.26	.33	.50	1.	.11	.43	.03	-.02	.28	.19	.30	.32	.21	.12	.27	.48	.14
18	.07	.13	.10	.10	.20	.18	.11	1.	.33	.07	-.23	.01	.09	.15	.23	.02	-.18	.06	.20	.26
19	.36	.32	.08	.23	.37	.55	.43	.33	1.	.14	.07	.20	.14	.31	.33	.36	.00	.26	.41	.23
20	-.01	-.07	.31	.12	.28	.10	.03	.07	.14	1.	.02	.02	-.10	.11	.17	-.07	-.09	-.10	.08	.08
21	-.04	-.08	.09	-.08	-.09	-.07	-.02	-.23	.07	.02	1.	.16	-.00	.03	-.04	.08	.23	-.03	-.06	.06
22	.16	.35	.15	.16	.19	.30	.28	.01	.20	.02	.16	1.	.29	.23	.08	.14	.16	.36	.21	.18
23	.14	.19	-.01	.09	-.02	.26	.19	.09	.14	-.10	-.00	.29	1.	.20	.11	.17	-.05	.30	.20	.05
24	.31	.31	.04	.16	.16	.37	.30	.14	.31	.11	.03	.23	.20	1.	.38	.14	.20	.30	.24	.20
25	.22	.27	.11	.27	.20	.33	.32	.23	.33	.17	-.04	.08	.11	.38	1.	.25	.08	.27	.23	.31
26	.33	.22	.05	.19	.27	.37	.21	.02	.36	.07	.08	.14	.17	.14	.25	1.	.09	.34	.39	.29
27	.13	.20	.08	.08	.06	.08	.12	-.18	.00	-.09	.23	.16	-.05	.20	.08	.09	1.	.13	.16	.00
28	.20	.30	.03	.18	.25	.43	.27	.05	.26	-.10	-.03	.36	.30	.30	.27	.34	.13	1.	.44	.29
29	.38	.37	.12	.21	.39	.51	.48	.20	.41	.08	-.06	.21	.20	.24	.23	.39	.16	.44	1.	.28
30	.26	.09	.02	.13	.23	.29	.14	.26	.23	.08	.06	.18	.05	.20	.31	.29	.00	.29	.28	1.

Table 3

Factor Matrix Using Principal Factor with Iterations

Items	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	h^2
11.	.57	-.06	.06	-.21	.15	.17	.43
12.	.57	-.24	.08	-.14	-.27	.10	.50
13.	.18	.26	-.38	.07	-.15	-.15	.29
14.	.38	.14	-.10	.00	-.14	-.02	.19
15.	.59	.33	-.16	-.27	.07	-.11	.58
16.	.78	.04	.06	-.15	.07	-.06	.65
17.	.64	-.08	.02	-.18	-.19	.10	.49
18.	.27	.37	.33	.16	-.13	-.08	.37
19.	.63	.15	.05	.00	.04	.04	.43
20.	.15	.49	-.35	.08	-.06	-.04	.39
21.	-.01	-.23	-.43	.17	.16	.05	.29
22.	.43	-.32	-.19	.12	-.18	-.34	.49
23.	.31	-.25	.16	.16	-.09	-.23	.27
24.	.50	-.09	-.02	.21	-.14	.20	.36
25.	.52	.17	.03	.37	-.10	.31	.54
26.	.50	-.04	-.04	.05	.36	.00	.39
27.	.18	-.32	-.35	-.05	-.01	.23	.32
28.	.55	-.26	.07	.16	.10	-.19	.46
29.	.65	-.01	.05	-.12	.10	-.06	.45
30.	.41	.10	.07	.28	.28	-.02	.34
Eigen-values	4.65	1.11	.827	.589	.532	.494	8.20
% Variance of Total	25.9	8.6	7.4	5.8	5.7	5.3	

Table 4

Factor Loadings After Varimax Rotation

Items	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
11.	.60	-.05	.12	.22	.03	.06
12.	.56	-.06	.26	-.12	.32	.05
13.	.05	.53	.03	-.02	.07	.06
14.	.27	.27	.17	.04	.13	-.05
15.	.57	.44	-.05	.21	.01	-.09
16.	.67	.15	.13	.30	.25	-.08
17.	.61	.08	.24	-.02	.22	.01
18.	.11	.14	.24	.28	.12	-.11
19.	.48	.17	.24	.13	.07	-.51
20.	.01	.60	.10	.08	-.15	-.04
21.	-.12	.10	.02	.13	.06	.50
22.	.19	.16	.04	.03	.62	.19
23.	.11	-.10	.09	.10	.47	-.07
24.	.28	.05	.47	.11	.21	.09
25.	.21	.15	.64	.24	.05	-.06
26.	.35	.03	.06	.49	.11	.12
27.	.19	.00	.13	-.05	.06	.51
28.	.30	-.06	.12	.34	.48	.05
29.	.56	.08	.08	.27	.22	-.05
30.	.14	.07	.20	.50	.11	-.08
Eigen-values	2.62	1.07	1.04	1.09	1.24	.89
% Variance Common	56.7	13.5	10.1	7.2	6.5	6.0

Notes

1. Stephenson, William. "The Ludenic Theory of Newsreading." Journalism Quarterly, XLI (Summer, 1964), 367-374.
2. Stephenson, William. The Study of Behavior: Q-Technique and Its Methodology. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953.
3. Schramm, Wilbur and David M. White. "Age, Education, Economic Status: Factors in Newspaper Reading," Journalism Quarterly, XXXI (June, 1949). 149-159.
4. Edelstein, Alex. Review of William Stephenson, The Play Theory of Mass Communication (Chicago). Journalism Quarterly, XLIX (Autumn, 1967). 565-566.
5. Huizinga, Johan. Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955. Pp. 1-27.
6. Stephenson, William. Play Theory. Pp. 45-65.
7. Ibid. P. 55.
8. Ibid. P. 57.
9. Huizinga. Op. cit. Pp. 7-11.
10. Stephenson. "The Ludenic Theory of Newsreading." 369-370.
11. Ibid. 370.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Stephenson. Play Theory. P. 149.
16. Berelson, Bernard. "What Missing the Newspaper Means." The Process and Effects of Mass Communications, ed. Wilbur Schramm. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1960. Pp. 35-47.

17. Janowitz, Morris. The Community Press in an Urban Setting. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1952. P. 152.

18. Cooley, Charles H. "The Significance of Communications," Reader in Public Opinion and Communications, eds. Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1950. Pp. 145-153.

19. Schramm, Wilbur. "The Nature of News." Journalism Quarterly, XXVI (September, 1949). 359-369.

20. Schramm, "Age, Education, Economic Status." 149-159.

21. Ibid.

22. Kay, Herbert. "Toward an Understanding of News-Reading Behavior." Journalism Quarterly, XXXI (Winter, 1954). 15-32.

23. Ibid. P. 18.

24. Ibid. P. 21.

25. Wiebe, Gerhart D. "Two Psychological Factors in Media Audience Behavior." Mass Media and Society, ed. Alan Wells. Palo Alto: National Press Books, 1972. Pp. 208-217.

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid.

28. Crumley, Wilma, "Newsreading Behavior and Anxiety." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Missouri, 1963. Also Rose Ross, "Comparison of Reward and Value Theories in Newsreading Behavior," Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Missouri, 1962. Anna M. Cornetta. "A Study of Ego-Involvement in Newsreading." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Missouri, 1962.

29. Stephenson. Play Theory. P. 157.

30. DeFleur, Melvin L. Review of William Stephenson, Play Theory of Mass Communication (Chicago). American Sociological Review, XXXIII (June, 1968). 482-483.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid.

33. Hughes, Helen M. News and the Human Interest Story. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1940. Pp. 1-29.

34. Stephenson. Play Theory. P. 2.

35. Kaplan, Abraham. The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavorial Science. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964. Pp. 320-322.

36. The Daily Collegian is the student-funded daily at California State University, Fresno.

37. Stephenson, William. "Application of Q-Method to the Measurement of Public Opinion." The Psychological Record, XIV (July, 1964). 266.

38. Rummel, R. J. Applied Factor Analysis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970. P. 31. Also:

. Selltiz, Claire and others. Research Methods in Social Relations. Rev. ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963. P. 52.

39. Nie, Norman, Dale H. Bent, and C. Hadlai Hull. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970. Pp. 208-244.

40. Stephenson, William. "Philosophical Credo." The Psychological Record, XI (1961). 1-8.

41. Stephenson, William. Play Theory. P. 2.

42. Ibid.

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid. P. 157.